

REMARKS

Claims 16, 26, 33, 34, 44 and 46-51 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 16 is amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied references. The amendments are supported in the specification by at least the fifth to seventh embodiments at pages 74-120 and by Figs. 35-68.

Claims 2-15, 17-25, 27-32, and 35-43 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner.

Applicant appreciates the Office Action's withdrawal of the finality of the previous Office Action.

I. Rejection based on Travis in view of Sudo

The Office Action rejects claims 16, 26, 33, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Travis (U.S. Patent No. 5,132,839) in view of Sudo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,798,390). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action at page 2 asserts that Travis discloses a "two-dimensional image forming means" at col. 8, line 37 and at Figure 5 (referring to two dimensional display 4). However, Travis' two dimensional display 4 is a component of a light source for spatial light modulator 2 and thus does not form an image. Specifically, Travis states that "the two dimensional display device 4 and the lens 1 together comprise a back-lighting means for the spatial light modulator" and "the two dimensional display device 4 may comprise spot sources of light or vertical line sources of light." See Travis at col. 4, lines 46-48 and 60-61. Therefore, Travis' two dimensional display 4 does not form an image and thus cannot be interpreted to be the "two-dimensional image forming means" recited in independent claim 16.

Furthermore, Travis fails to disclose a three-dimensional image display having a three-dimensional image forming means with a deflecting means for deflecting the projecting

direction of light exiting an image formed by a two-dimensional image forming means, as recited in independent claim 16. As disclosed in Travis at Fig. 5 and at col. 8, lines 50-55, the direction of light 8 "depends on the position of the spot 7 in the screen 3 of the two dimensional display device 4." Thus, the deflection of light in the Travis device is performed before the formation of a two-dimensional image (at spatial light modulator 2; see Travis at col. 8, lines 46-48). The Travis device therefore does not deflect light exiting the two-dimensional image forming means, as required by claim 16.

The Office Action acknowledges that Travis does not teach a three-dimensional forming means with a deflecting means for deflecting the projecting direction of the two-dimensional image by deflecting the light which has exited the tow-dimensional image forming means, and relies on Sudo to remedy the deficiencies of Travis. However, Sudo fails to disclose deflecting means that deflects parallel beams of light exiting a two-dimensional image forming means, as required by claim 16. As shown in Sudo at Fig. 3, the light exiting image display 1 is not parallel. Thus, even if Travis is modified with Sudo, the resulting combination would not result in the apparatus recited in claim 16.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection based on Travis in view of Hattori

The Office Action rejects claims 46-51 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Travis in view of Hattori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,316). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper because it does not explain how Hattori serves as a basis for the rejection. The Office Action also fails to identify where Travis is deficient, or how Hattori remedies the deficiencies of Travis. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant further states, to the extent the bases of the rejection can be understood, that Travis fails to disclose a three-dimensional image display having a two-dimensional image

forming means for forming a plurality of two-dimensional images by scanning light which has been subjected to time-modulation based on information on rearrangement of data of each of pixel of the plurality of two-dimensional images, as recited in independent claim 44. As argued above, with regard to claim 16, the display of the Travis device is controlled by the position of spots 7 and the timing of the display of the spots 7 by controller 99. See Travis at col. 8, lines 50-58. The timing of the display of Travis' spots 7 is simultaneous for each frame of the two-dimensional image and, thus, not based on information relating to each pixel.

With regard to independent claim 49, and in addition to the above arguments, Travis fails to disclose a three-dimensional image display having a three-dimensional image forming means for forming a three-dimensional image by projecting the light emitted by the two-dimensional image forming means in different directions in accordance with positions of incidence to project the plurality of two-dimensional images in directions different from each other, wherein the three-dimensional image forming means has a region in which position information used for controlling the positions of incidence of the light emitted by the two-dimensional image forming means is recorded, as recited in claim 49.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Steven W. Allis
Registration No. 50,532

JAO:SWA/eks

Date: January 17, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--